

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,726	02/04/2004	Jamieson William Maclean Crawford	P-3522/22C1	4956
31948 7	590 01/24/2006		EXAMINER THANH, LOAN H	
DAVID W. H	IIGHET, VP AND CH	HIEF IP COUNSEL		
BECTON, DIC	KINSON AND COMP	ANY		
1 BECTON DE	RIVE, MC 110		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FRANKLINI	AKES NI 07417-188	Λ	2762	

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		ϵ	_
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
,	10/771,726	CRAWFORD ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	LoAn H. Thanh	3763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
Period for Reply	D	10NTH(0) OD THIDTY (00) DA	V0
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION IN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a liod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04	1 February 2004.		
•—	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow			ts is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the applicati	ion.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 4</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) <u>2,3 and 5-15</u> is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 February 2005</u> is,		objected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to t		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-15	i2.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ian priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	.g., p.,, a.,.a., e. e. e.e.	3 (.) (.) (.)	
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	priority documents have bee	n received in this National Stage	е
application from the International Bur	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies no	t received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB. 		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
2) [Mail Date <u>02/04/04</u> .	6) Other: _		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Application/Control Number: 10/771,726

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1,4 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 27-28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,699,217.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because U.S. Patent 6,699,217 does not claim a shield with a forward and rearward portion wherein the rearward portion is cross-sectionally larger that the forward portion. The limitation of a forward and rearward portion of the shield is such a basic/generic referencing of parts to describe structural location to each other, it is considered to be an inherent part of the shield. (i.e. that there is a forward and rearward portion). However, one ordinarily skilled in the shielding medical arts would perceive

Art Unit: 3763

this minimal limitation to be inherent if not obvious to any element. Further, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the shielding medical arts that the forward or distal portion would enclose the needle and the rearward or proximal portion would enclose the hub. With respect to the rearward portion having a cross section larger the forward portion, it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the shielding medical arts to design the rearward portion that is enclosing the hub to be larger that the forward portion enclosing portion of the needle since the cross section of the needle is substantially consistently smaller than the hub portion. Further, this would have been an obvious design choice to alter the sizes of the elements.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LoAn H. Thanh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4966. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri. (First Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on (571) 272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frimary Examiner
Art Unit 3763

LT

01/18/06